Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at Argosy University

May 13, 2008

Overview of This Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the Accreditation Team visit conducted at Argosy University. The report of the team presents the findings based upon reading the Institutional Self-Study Reports, review of supporting documentation and interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the attached report, the accreditation recommendation is **Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations**.

Common Standards and Program Standard Decisions
For all Programs offered by the Institution or Program Sponsor

Common Standards

	Standard Met	Standard Met with Concerns	Standard Not Met
Standard 1: Education Leadership		X	
Standard 2: Resources		X	
Standard 3: Faculty		X	
Standard 4: Evaluation		X	
Standard 5: Admission	X		
Standard 6: Advice and Assistance		X	
Standard 7: School Collaboration		X	
Standard 8: District Field Supervisors		X	

Program Standards

	Total # of Program Standards	Number of Program Standards		
		Standard Met	Standard Met with Concerns	Standard Not Met
Multiple Subject	19	15		4
Single Subject	19	15		4

The site visit was completed in accordance with the procedures approved by the Committee on Accreditation regarding the activities of the site visit:

- Preparation for the Accreditation Visit
- Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report

- Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team
- Intensive Evaluation of Program Data
- Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

Argosy University serves a small number of credential candidates in four different sites: the Southern California Region, with satellites in Orange County, Santa Monica and the Inland Empire, and a San Francisco Bay Area site located in Alameda. Three team members and one CTC staff person traveled to the Inland Empire and San Francisco locations on Thursday, April 17, 2008 to conduct constituent interviews prior to the beginning of the site visit on Sunday, April 20. Following the interviews, team members maintained interview notes in a secure location and did not discuss the results of the interviews until the entire team met on Sunday, April 20, 2008 for the team meeting and accreditation visit orientation. Orange County and Santa Monica constituents were interviewed in person and by telephone during the April 20-23, 2008 accreditation visit.

Institution: **Argosy University**

Dates of Visit: **April 20-23, 2008**

Accreditation Team
Recommendation: **Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations**

Rationale:
The unanimous recommendation of Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations was based on a thorough review of the institutional self-study; additional supporting documents available during the visit; interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, graduates, and local school personnel; along with additional information requested from program leadership during the visit. The team felt that it obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit's operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

Common Standards— The team found one Common Standard to be Met: 5: Admission. Seven of the Common Standards are Met with Concerns: 1: Educational Leadership, 2: Resources, 3: Faculty, 4: Evaluation, 6: Advice and Assistance, 7: School Collaboration and 8: District Field Supervisors.

Program Standards – For the Multiple Subject program, 15 standards were met and four standards were not met: 1: Program Design, 2: Collaboration in Governing the Program, 14: Preparation to Teach Special Populations in the General Education Classroom and 17: Candidate Qualifications for Teaching Responsibilities in the Fieldwork Sequence. In the Single Subject program 15 standards were met, four were not met: 1: Program Design, 2: Collaboration in Governing the Program, 14: Preparation to Teach Special Populations in the General Education Classroom and 17: Candidate Qualifications for Teaching Responsibilities in the Fieldwork Sequence.

Overall Recommendation – Due to the fact that there are a number of Common and Program Standards that are less than fully met, the team is recommending an accreditation decision of **Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations** for Argosy University and its credential programs.

Following are the recommended stipulations:
1. That the institution is required to provide evidence that all Standards less than fully met are met within one year of the date of this action.

2. That a revisit take place within one year to review evidence related to all standards not fully met including the sequence of coursework, involvement of the university on Induction Advisory

Boards, verification of candidates' completion of the subject matter requirement prior to student teaching and verification candidates are being informed of the Induction program.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credentials:

Multiple Subject   Single Subject
   Multiple Subject   Single Subject

Staff recommends that:
- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- Argosy University be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- The university has a focused revisit in 2009.
- Argosy University continue in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Accreditation Team

Team Leader: **Barbara Morton**
                                          Concordia University

Common Standards Cluster: **Gary Kinsey**
                                          California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

Basic Credential Programs Cluster: **Katherine Theuer**
                                          Chapman University

                                          Charles Weber
                                          Antelope Valley Union High School District

Staff to the Accreditation Team: **Marilynn Fairgood**, Consultant

Documents Reviewed

University Catalog   Schedule of Classes
Institutional Self Study   Annual Improvement Plan
Course Syllabi   Faculty Vitae
Candidate Files   University Annual Report
Fieldwork Handbooks   Argosy California Campus Budgets
Follow-up Survey Results   Course and Faculty Evaluations
College of Education Meeting Minutes

Interviews Conducted

	Team Leader	Common Standards	Basic Credential Cluster	TOTAL
Program Faculty	0	3	10	**13**
Institutional Administration	5	3	10	**18**
Candidates	16	7	22	**45**
Graduates	2	5	13	**20**
Employers of Graduates	0	0	3	**3**
Supervising Practitioners/Master Teachers	1	1	1	**3**
Advisors	0	1	1	**2**
School Administrators	0	0	2	**2**
Credential Analysts and Staff	1	1	2	**4**
Advisory Committee	1	0	0	**1**
			TOTAL	**111**

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster (especially faculty) because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

Background Information

Argosy University evolved as a result of a 2001 merger of three long standing higher education institutions: the American School of Professional Psychology, the University of Sarasota, and the Medical Institute of Minnesota. Accredited by the Higher Learning Commission and the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, the university has 18 campuses nationwide. Argosy University is dedicated to providing high quality professional education programs at the doctoral, masters, baccalaureate, and associate degree levels, as well as continuing education to individuals who seek to improve their personal and professional lives. The Argosy University California campuses are the only sites that offer teacher credential programs. Programs and program administration are monitored by the Argosy University headquarters in Chicago, Illinois. A Dean of the College of Education assures programmatic conformity and quality system wide. Each Argosy campus has a Vice President of Academic Affairs whose responsibilities include supervision of all academic programs, including the College of Education.

Education Unit

The Argosy College of Education has been authorized to offer Multiple and Single Subject credential programs since 2001. Argosy was also initially approved to offer Multiple and Single Subject credential programs with a BCLAD option. However, the university has not enrolled BCLAD candidates since 2006. Because there are currently no BCLAD candidates the BCLAD programs were not reviewed during this accreditation visit and the university is in the process of withdrawing its BCLAD programs.

Although Argosy maintains undergraduate programs for its professional degree programs it does not provide a feeder source into its College of Education. The Argosy College of Education currently serves a total of 64 credential candidates. Candidates who complete the Argosy

credential programs concurrently earn a Masters degree. Argosy University produced 62 program completers in 2006-2007.

Credential coursework is offered as a blend of online and on the ground courses. Online coursework can make up as much as 49% of required coursework. Those taught on campus attend either weeknight or weekend courses. The university has a total of 4 full-time faculty and more than 30 adjunct faculty. Almost all faculty possess doctorate degrees and some are graduates of Argosy University.

In January 2008 in an effort to strengthen its credential programs, Argosy University made a number of changes to the College of Education and its programs. The university structure shifted from four separate campuses (Orange County, Santa Monica, Inland Empire and San Diego, which does not currently offer credential programs) to one Southern California Regional Center located in Orange County. Each campus previously had a President and a Credentials Chair. The four separate Presidents and Program Chair positions were consolidated into one regional President and one regional Credentials Program Chair.

With the support of its Interim Dean and Vice President of Academic Affairs from Chicago, who were present during the Argosy accreditation visit, it was evident to team members that Argosy University is making many programmatic changes to improve its credential programs.

Table 1
Program Review Status

Program Name	Program Level (Initial or Advanced)	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs
Multiple Subject	Initial	33	CTC
Single Subject	Initial	31	CTC

The Visit
The visit to Argosy University began on Thursday, April, 17, 2008 with the constituent interviews that were conducted at the San Francisco and Inland Empire sites. Team activities began on Sunday, April 20, 2008 at noon. The team members met at the hotel for a team meeting and to begin preparations for the visit. Argosy University held a reception at the hotel and team members met the university Interim Dean and Vice President of Academic Affairs from Chicago and university administrators from the other California sites. On Monday morning a university shuttle picked up team members and transported them to the university for an orientation to the document room. Data collection began after the orientation with team members travelling to school sites, conducting onsite interviews and reviewing documentation. Team members continued their data collection on Tuesday. On Tuesday morning the team lead presented the Mid-Visit Report to the chair of the department. On Tuesday evening the team met to discuss all standards to determine whether or not all standards were met. Consensus was reached on all standard findings and an accreditation recommendation. The Exit Report was held on Wednesday, April 23, 2008 at noon.

Common Standards

Standard 1: Educational Leadership   Met with Concerns

> The institution (faculty, dean/director and institutional administration) articulates and supports a vision for the preparation of professional educators. All professional preparation programs are organized, governed, and coordinated with the active involvement of credential program faculty. Institutional leadership fosters cohesiveness in management; delegates responsibility and authority appropriately; resolves each professional preparation program's administrative needs as promptly as feasible; and represents the interests of each program in the institution, the education profession, and the school community.

Argosy University has established a clear vision and delineated their expected outcomes for the preparation of professional educators. The teacher credentialing programs for California are housed within the College of Education (centrally administered from the main campus in Chicago, Illinois) and are overseen by the Program Chairs in Northern and Southern California. Generally, these individuals report to the respective Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs, who in turn report to the Campus Presidents in each of the primary California sites. The Program Chairs are responsible for overseeing all aspects of the credential programs. They hire the faculty, support the students at each campus, teach coursework, oversee assessment/evaluation of programs, manage the resources and are actively involved in the development and ongoing administration of the credential programs.

Program chairs meet regularly with the leaders of other programs within the university, under the auspices of the President or the Vice President of Academic Affairs. As such, they provide input into the overall operations of each campus. Also, each of the Program chairs participates in a monthly teleconference with all 18 Argosy nationwide campuses, planned and led by the (interim) Dean of Education located in Chicago. California contains the only AU campuses that offer teacher credentialing programs and advanced degrees in education (the other AU campuses offer advanced degree programs in education only).

As the visiting team was convening for the review, changes were either underway or had been recently made in some roles and responsibilities. This made it challenging to truly understand the effectiveness of the organizational hierarchy, as it was still evolving as the team was onsite. Some program personnel and students also reported that they were unaware of job responsibility changes as a consolidation of services occurred for the Southern California campuses.

Though the self-study document indicates that Program chairs seek widespread faculty consultation and approval regarding all matters pertaining to academic policy review or change, this was not clearly evident after multiple interviews and an analysis of documentation in the evidence room. The fact that a significantly large proportion of AU faculty are adjuncts may cause a greater challenge in achieving broader participation by those actually delivering the program. Purportedly, all program faculty are invited to attend quarterly faculty/staff meetings, but there was no clear evidence of consistent and wide participation by adjuncts in meetings at any of the California campuses.

To address areas for general program or institutional improvement, Internal Effectiveness Review Committees have been formed system-wide and chaired by the Campus Presidents. It includes representatives from each academic program, the Library, the Office of Admissions, and the Office of Student Services. The general work of this committee is to review and respond to

academic and organizational issues in an efficient and timely manner. A major focus is the improvement of educational programs and services.

Some of the practices of the California campuses regarding management of the teacher credentialing program requirements are sometimes fragmented or inconsistent. There are examples of specific practices going on at one campus that could clearly benefit the others. One best practice might show up at one campus, while another good practice might be demonstrated at a different site. If they worked more closely together or developed a more centralized management structure, these strategies could be shared with all and become more consistent across all the California locations.

Areas of Strength in Standard Implementation:
The recent revisions for the credential program regarding leadership responsibilities and the consolidation of roles is a positive step but was challenging for the visiting review team due to the timing.

Areas for Growth in Standard Implementation:
Any changes in roles and responsibilities of program leaders or staff should be clearly conveyed to the relevant program personnel and students as they occur. Additionally, this should be well documented or reflected in all program materials, as soon as reasonably possible, for the purpose of accurate advising.

Standard 2: Resources   **Met with Concerns**

> Sufficient resources are consistently allocated for the effective operation of credential preparation program, to enable it to be effective in coordination, advising, curriculum, instruction, and field experiences. Library and media computer facilities, and support personnel, among others, are adequate.

Argosy University (AU) campuses hire faculty members for their programs based on enrollment growth and program development. Currently, each California campus or center has one (1) appointed full-time faculty member and several part-time (or adjunct) instructors to teach in the teacher credential programs. Interviews and hiring are done exclusively by the Program Chairs as the need warrants.

Full-time faculty are responsible for teaching up to eight courses per year, advising students, supervision of student teachers in some cases, and participation in professional development opportunities when they are available. Part-time faculty members are responsible for teaching at least two courses per year, and are available to students as needed. Students indicate that faculty and adjuncts are very responsive and questions are answered quickly and adequately.

After careful review of the self-study document, interview information, and supporting documents, the visiting team had concerns regarding the small number of full-time faculty at the larger California AU campuses and the ability to attain the consistency, appropriate evaluation and support needed for program delivery.

AU campuses attempt to provide resources and support for faculty development university-wide, but it appears that very little is focused on the specific needs of those working in teacher preparation and the unique aspects of California and federal requirements. Library and technology resources appear equitable, and adequate. The multi media collections, journals, online access and books serving students in all credential programs are suitable to the needs of the academic programs they serve.

Program candidates appear to have sufficient opportunity for contact with faculty members who are available at designated times and by email or phone to answer candidate questions and concerns. Course syllabi include information as to how students can easily contact instructors outside of class time and this information is discussed at the first class meetings.

As institutions offering onsite and online courses, the California AU campuses have committed to maintaining up-to-date technology resources for all students, faculty, and staff. Computer resources (PCs at each campus with high-speed Internet access, a scanner, and a laser printer) are available to students in the computer lab at each campus. All students also receive an email account on AU's Intranet system. Students may enroll in courses, order textbooks, download course syllabi, and engage in discussion groups with fellow students, staff, or faculty via this system.

A budget and planning Advisory Committee is responsible for the development, implementation and monitoring of the College annual budget, but no evidence was found to indicate the frequency of these meetings, the specific topics, the meeting participants or actions and outcomes. Requests are reportedly made for supplemental funding based upon department priority.

Areas of Strength in Standard Implementation
Overall facilities (classroom spaces, faculty offices, staff and general use areas) are very good and well-equipped. Campus classrooms for all the California sites would be considered to be of smart-classroom caliber with the latest technology for use by instructors and students.

Areas of Growth in Standard Implementation
The number of full-time faculty per each of the main campuses does not allow for greater distribution of key programmatic responsibilities at a site (Northern and Southern California). Consideration should be given to the employment of additional full-time faculty.

Standard 3: Faculty   **Met with Concerns**

> Qualified persons are hired and assigned to teach all courses and supervise all field experiences in each credential preparation program. Faculty reflect and are knowledgeable about cultural, ethnic, and gender diversity. The institution provides support for faculty development, and recognizes and rewards outstanding teaching. The institution regularly evaluates the performance of course instructors and field supervisors, and retains in credential programs only those individuals who are consistently effective.

Argosy University actively seeks instructors and field experience supervisors who are knowledgeable about teacher preparation. Faculty resumes seem to indicate that instructors generally have the appropriate background and experience for the courses they are teaching, though there were some exceptions. Program Chairs indicate that instructors and field

experience supervisors are expected to possess a mastery of the theoretical framework for their disciplines that includes knowledge of effective practices for the teaching and learning of students from diverse backgrounds.

According to the self study, program leaders regularly evaluate the performance of course instructors and field supervisors through a process that incorporates end-of-course evaluations responded to by candidates. Evidence of these evaluations was provided to the visiting team, but interviews seemed to indicate that faculty (the adjuncts) did not see these evaluation results, nor were they discussed with them. It appears that faculty who do not perform well are not given additional courses, nor asked back.

AU states that faculty development is essential for effective teaching and professional development, though it does not appear that much occurs for the specific needs of teacher preparation, especially in the California contexts. Throughout the AU system, full-time faculty contracts include paid time away from the school for professional development. Additionally, they receive funding to participate in professional development activities, including attendance or presentations at regional or national professional meetings, workshops, or conferences in the field of education (these resources do not appear to be available to the adjuncts who are the bulk of the overall faculty in California).

Areas of Strength in Standard Implementation:
Almost unanimously, students talked of the quality of the support and assistance provided by faculty.

Areas for Growth in Standard Implementation:
Consideration should be given to involving and gathering input from adjunct faculty in the program, as they are making significant contributions to the AU teacher credential program delivery.

Standard 4: Evaluation   **Met with Concerns**

The institution regularly involves program participants, graduates, and local practitioners in a comprehensive evaluation of the quality of courses and field experiences, which leads to substantive improvements in each credential preparation program, as needed. Meaningful opportunities are provided for professional practitioners and diverse community members to become involved in program design, development and evaluation activities.

The development of collaborative partnerships to enhance the AU credential programs are an ongoing process for each of the campuses. Each is working to formulate or strengthen their Advisory Boards so that they can contribute substantively to the quality and effectiveness of the design and implementation of the candidate preparation programs.

At the conclusion of each course or field experience, candidates evaluate their courses, instructors, or field experience supervisors according to whether they have done their part in meeting goals and objectives for candidate preparation. This is consistent with the course evaluation process that has been in place system-wide for some time at AU.

Additional program data addressing competence and performance criteria used to assess candidates are collected from candidates, master teachers, and field experience supervisors at the completion of each semester. This information is compiled, reviewed, and evaluated by the Program Chair. According to interviews, feedback from students, some faculty, university supervisors, and mentor teachers help inform decisions made by the Program Chair regarding needed modifications. It was stated that Program Chairs "own" the credential programs and have full responsibility and accountability for those pathways. One recent change was a complete redesign of the evaluation forms, and a reformatting of the Field Experience Handbook.

At the end of each semester (or two times per year in December and May), the Program Chairs initiate the collection of evaluation data, then review and analyze the results. In the future, it is anticipated that advisory committees will have a role in the evaluation of teacher prep programs for the California campuses. The program does not regularly involve program employers and local practitioners (mentor teachers, etc.) in the evaluation of the quality of credential programs. The evidence found was not systematically collected across all programs with any regularity or consistency.

Standard 5: Admissions   **Standard Met**

> In each professional preparation program, candidates are admitted on the basis of well defined admission criteria and procedures (including all Commission-adopted admission requirements) that utilize multiple measures. The admission of students from a diverse population is encouraged. The institution determines that candidates meet high academic standards, as evidenced by appropriate measures of academic achievement, and demonstrate strong potential for professional success in schools, as evidenced by appropriate measures of personal characteristics and prior experience.

Program Chairs at the California campuses review and approve all candidates for admission. Admissions criteria and procedures are clearly described, include multiple measures and contain required Commission-adopted elements. These criteria are available to candidates upon request (by mail) or through personal informational interviews at each campus.

Campuses screen applicants for admission on the basis of information about their proficiency that goes beyond the grade point average. This includes letters of recommendation, resume or vita, and personal interviews.

The university is implementing a rigorous Writing Competency Requirement. Entering students will be required to take a writing diagnostic exam within 30 days after matriculation. Based on the diagnostic scores, the student may be required to register for a developmental writing course in the current or subsequent session at the latest.

Areas of Strength in Standard Implementation:
Students noted that the admissions process was very personalized, quick and efficient.

Standard 6: Advice and Assistance   **Met with Concerns**

Qualified members of the institution's staff are assigned and available to advise candidates about their academic, professional and personal development, as the need arises, and to assist in their professional placement. Adequate information is readily available to guide each candidate's attainment of all program and credential requirements. The institution assists candidates who need special assistance, and retains in each program only those candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession.

Program Chairs, Faculty Advisors, and University Supervisors indicate they meet at the beginning of each semester to review the expectations, evaluation instruments, and questions or concerns regarding how candidates will receive accurate information, sound advice, and supportive assistance throughout the AU programs. In this way, the campuses provide candidates with accurate information and advice concerning the requirements for each of the programs and information about services.

Where necessary, the Program Chair also meets with candidates to clarify services available and ensure there are no problems learning about or accessing them. For example, at the pre-semester student orientation, candidates are advised by the Program Chair to share with program faculty and staff their questions, concerns, and comments about any service needs as they arise. Students indicated that faculty were in fact, always willing to entertain questions in regard to program and credential requirements. Additionally, each campus assists students and prospective students regarding credential program requirements. Student records for credential programs are housed in the campus center of attendance and most students' information appears to be compiled and retrieved by hand.

Students frequently commented they received consistent information in regard to questions about the credential program. However, documents and interviews pointed to some discrepancies between the levels of awareness for candidates regarding the process for clearing SB 2042 Credentials in Multiple or Single Subjects and the need for the credentials to be cleared through one of the state prescribed Induction options. Additionally, faculty and student knowledge of the Teacher Performance Assessment implementation and its specific requirements was generally weak or nonexistent. Also, there was some confusion as to when CSET or other subject matter requirements must be met.

Areas of Strength in Standard Implementation:
Student interaction with faculty and staff on advisement issues is very strong and faculty and staff are always readily available to assist in a prompt manner.

Standard 7: School Collaboration   **Met with Concerns**

For each credential preparation program, the institution collaborates with local school personnel in selecting suitable school sites and effective clinical personnel for guiding candidates through a planned sequence of fieldwork/clinical experiences that is based on a well developed rationale.

There is an awareness by AU of the need to closely collaborate with K-12 public school educators (teachers and administrators) in the selection of suitable school sites and effective clinical personnel (for guiding the candidates placed at those sites).

Field experience agreements are approved by individual K-12 school district board of trustees and approved by the AU Program Chair. In consultation with local administrators and teachers, Argosy University has developed and implemented clear, explicit criteria for the selection of schools and district field experience supervisors. The self-study indicates that AU seeks to place candidates in specific classrooms where the need is greatest, and where it is a good fit for the individual candidates. The visiting team interviews seemed to indicate that the candidates often selected where they wanted to go and the university attempted to honor that request. There was no evidence to be found that these requested sites were carefully scrutinized for suitability and state compliance to assure quality. They seemed to be more a matter of convenience for the candidate. Also, many students indicated they remained at the same school-site for both parts of their AU student teaching. The university attempts to maintain close and regular contact between its campuses and the administrative structures within the school districts that are tasked with placing student teachers.

As mentioned previously, Argosy participates with several school districts to place students for student teaching. These collaborations also include using local district personnel as adjunct faculty to provide practical, real life experiences for credential candidates. However, the university does not seem to consistently coordinate or support early fieldwork experiences in K-12 classrooms prior to student teaching. Several students interviewed had not observed or worked in classrooms until their student teaching portion of the program, although syllabi indicated that field experiences were required in some courses.

AU does not seem to recognize the need required by SB 2042 for specific types of collaboration with BTSA-Induction programs as a part of the California "learning to teach continuum." They cited one specific collaboration to provide university credit for Induction events or training, but did not have any AU program faculty or administrators participating on BTSA-Induction Advisory Boards. Additionally, AU candidates seemed to generally be unaware of the requirements for clearing their credentials after receiving the Preliminary Credential and Induction options.

Areas of Strength in Standard Implementation:
Interviews with students indicated a positive and useful field supervision experience for student teaching.

Standard 8: District Field Supervisors   **Met with Concerns**

> Each district-employed field experience supervisor is carefully selected, trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, and certified and experienced in either teaching the subject(s) of the class or performing the services authorized by the credential. District supervisors and supervisory activities are appropriately evaluated, recognized and rewarded by the institution.
>
> Each district-employed field experience supervisor is carefully selected, trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, and certified and experienced in either teaching the subject(s) of the class or performing the services authorized by the credential. District supervisors and supervisory activities are appropriately evaluated, recognized and rewarded by the institution.

Representatives from school districts assist AU in the selection of District Field Supervisors (mentor teachers) by referring faculty from their sites with whom they have positive relationships. The university collaborated with local school district personnel to develop criteria for district-employed field supervisors (mentor teachers).

Every candidate is required to evaluate his or her field placement mentor teacher following completion of the student teaching. Candidates will communicate directly with the Program Chair during the field experience if any conflicts arise, in which case reassignment may be considered.

AU appears to primarily rely on University Field Supervisors to communicate with their District Field Supervisors (Mentor Teachers) for informing them of changes in fieldwork requirements, to clarify supervision procedures, and/or to assess and discuss progress or concerns regarding student teachers. There is no evidence of assurance that District Field Supervisors are either oriented or trained by the AU program beyond a one-on-one orientation provided by the University Field Supervisors. Professional development seems to be random, if occurring at all for the teacher preparation areas. There is also a lack of evidence for support of District Field Supervisors (Mentor Teachers) and recognition for outstanding service.

Areas of Strength in Standard Implementation:
Almost all candidates were pleased with the support provided by their District Field Supervisors (mentor teachers). Some exceptions were noted with secondary candidates.

Areas for Growth in Standard Implementation:
AU should provide professional development opportunities and general orientations for District Field Supervisors (mentor teachers).

<p style="text-align: center;">**Multiple Subject Credential Program**</p>

Findings on Standards:
After reviews of the institutional report, the program documents, supporting documentation, and the completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, program administrators and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met except for the following:

Standard 1: Program Design   **Not Met**
1(b) Sequence of Program: A list of courses was found in the self study indicating which courses were the foundation courses, concentration courses, field experience and capstone. There was no mention in any documents of a specific sequence in which the courses were to be taken. Interviews with students and data in student files indicated that the sequence in which students took classes varied greatly and in some cases students were taking foundation and concentration courses during or after their student teaching experience.

Standard 2: Collaboration in Governing the Program   **Not Met**
2(f) Partnerships with Professional Induction Programs: There was no evidence that students were given any information or advisement regarding induction programs or that an effort was made to help candidates make the transition to professional induction programs.

Standard 14: Preparation to Teach Special Populations in the General Education Classroom   **Not Met**
14(a) Major Categories of Disabilities: The self study indicated that class instruction focuses on disability categories and the impact of disabilities on learning and behavior. An assignment called the "Characteristics Matrix" is mentioned as a way to synthesize what students learned about disabilities and how to provide accommodations. There was no evidence in any course syllabi of the matrix assignment or that disability categories or accommodations for students with specific disabilities are discussed in courses. Although student interviews indicated that students learned about making accommodations for students with special needs there was no evidence that they were informed of specific disability categories.

Standard 17: Candidate Qualifications for Teaching Responsibilities in the Fieldwork Sequence   **Not Met**
17(a) Verification of Completion of Subject Matter Competence: Based on student records and interviews with candidates it was evident that students were not required to verify completion of subject matter competence before student teaching. In some cases students completed all of student teaching prior to passing the appropriate subject matter examination.

Areas of Strength in Program Implementation:
Candidates and graduates reported that they were well prepared to effectively teach diverse students and apply learning to classroom practice.

Candidates and graduates reported, and course syllabi confirmed, a strong emphasis on teaching English language learners.

The program articulates and models the importance of reflecting on practice.

Areas for Growth in Program Implementation:
Candidates and graduates indicated that they would like more emphasis placed on classroom management and working with gifted students.

Syllabi indicate that fieldwork is embedded in coursework but candidates report that they did not spend much time in classrooms prior to student teaching.

Single Subject Credential Program

Findings on Standards
After reviews of the institutional report, the program documents, supporting documentation, and the completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, program administrators and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met expect for the following:

Standard 1: Program Design   **Not Met**
1(b) Sequence of Program: A list of courses was found in the self study indicating which courses were the foundation courses, concentration courses, field experience and capstone. There was no mention in any documents of a specific sequence in which the courses were to be taken. Interviews with students and data in student files indicated that the sequence in which students took classes varied greatly and in some cases students were taking foundation and concentration courses during or after their student teaching experience.

Standard 2: Collaboration in Governing the Program   **Not Met**
2(f) Partnerships with Professional Induction Programs: There was no evidence that students were given any information or advisement regarding induction programs or that an effort was made to help candidates make the transition to professional induction programs.

Standard 14: Preparation to Teach Special Populations in the General Education Classroom   **Not Met**
14(a) Major Categories of Disabilities: The self study indicated that class instruction focuses on disability categories and the impact of disabilities on learning and behavior. An assignment called the "Characteristics Matrix" is mentioned as a way to synthesize what students learned about disabilities and how to provide accommodations. There was no evidence in any course syllabi of the matrix assignment or that disability categories or accommodations for students with specific disabilities are discussed in courses. Although student interviews indicated that students learned about making accommodations for students with special needs there was no evidence that they were informed of specific disability categories.

Standard 17: Candidate Qualifications for Teaching Responsibilities in the Fieldwork Sequence   **Not Met**
17(a) Verification of Completion of Subject Matter Competence: Based on student records and interviews with candidates it was evident that students were not required to verify completion of subject matter competence before student teaching. In some cases students completed all of student teaching prior to passing the appropriate subject matter examination.

Strengths in Program Implementation:
Candidates and graduates reported that they were well prepared to effectively teach diverse students and apply learning to classroom practice.

Candidates and graduates reported, and course syllabi confirmed, a strong emphasis on teaching English language learners.

The program articulates and models the importance of reflecting on practice.

Areas for Growth in Program Implementation:
Candidates and graduates indicated that they would like more emphasis placed on classroom management and working with gifted students.

Syllabi indicate that fieldwork is embedded in coursework but candidates report that they did not spend much time in classrooms prior to student teaching.